



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT IMPORTANT DECISIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT—PERSONS ENTITLED TO TAKE—OFFICER AND STOCKHOLDER OF CORPORATION.—A bill in equity was filed to foreclose a deed of trust given by defendant corporation. The acknowledgment thereof was taken by a notary who was at the time a director and treasurer of the corporation and also indebted for unpaid subscriptions to its stock. But there was nothing on the face of the instrument or acknowledgment indicating such relationship. *Held*, that the acknowledgment is a ministerial act and the deed of trust was entitled to record and was notice to subsequent purchasers. *Ardmore Nat. Bank v. Briggs Machinery and Supply Co. et al.* (1908),—Okla.—, 94 Pac. Rep. 533.

As to whether an acknowledgment is a ministerial or judicial act there seems to be a diversity of holding. The weight of authority is to the effect that it is ministerial. *Loree v. Abrier*, 57 Fed. 159; *Scanlon v. Wright*, 13 Pick. (Mass.) 523; *Lynch v. Livingston*, 6 N. Y. 523. In some jurisdictions it is held judicial or quasi-judicial. *Heitman v. Kroh*, 155 Pa. St. 1; *Pickens v. Knisely*, 29 W. Va. 1. It is elementary that neither a party to nor one who is financially or beneficially interested in a deed can take the acknowledgment. *Wills v. Wood*, 28 Kan. 400; *Groesbeck v. Seeley*, 13 Mich. 330. And so a stockholder cannot acknowledge an instrument in which the corporation is interested. *Hayes v. Southern Home Bldg. Co.*, 124 Ala. 663; *Smith v. Clark*, 100 Ia. 605; *Kothe v. Krag-Reynolds Co.*, 20 Ind. App. 293. If the notary is an officer only and not a stockholder of the corporation, he is not disqualified. *Fla. Sav. Bank v. Rivers*, 36 Fla. 575; *Sawyer v. Cox*, 63 Ill. 130; *Horbach v. Tyrrell*, 48 Neb. 514. This case is surely on the border line. But it is supported by cases in Ohio and Tennessee, holding that an officer and stockholder of a corporation may take the acknowledgment where there is nothing on the face of the instrument to show such interest and where no fraud is present or undue advantage taken. *Read v. Toledo Loan Co.*, 68 Ohio St. 280; *Cooper v. Bldg. and Loan Assoc.* 97 Tenn 285. This question has been more or less affected by statutes in Ill., Ind., Ohio., Penn., Minn., and N. D.

AGENCY—BROKERS—CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT—MIDDLEMAN—WHEN COMMISSIONS ARE EARNED.—In an action to recover commissions on a sale of timber land alleged to have been made for defendants, the evidence showed that plaintiff asked of defendants the price of the land and examined it. Plaintiff then called the attention of his employer to the lands and a sale was made through an offer made by the purchaser to defendants. Plaintiff made his claim for a commission after the sale was consummated. No agreement was entered into for a commission, and defendant supposed plaintiff was buying for himself or for another. *Held*, that the evidence did not show that plaintiff was acting as a broker or agent of defendant in securing a